



ELSEVIER

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Computational Geometry 31 (2005) 219–236

Computational  
Geometry

Theory and Applications

[www.elsevier.com/locate/comgeo](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/comgeo)

# The Erdős–Nagy theorem and its ramifications

Godfried Toussaint<sup>1</sup>*School of Computer Science, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada*

Available online 25 January 2005

Communicated by J. Snoeyink

---

## Abstract

Given a simple polygon in the plane, a *flip* is defined as follows: consider the convex hull of the polygon. If there are no pockets do not perform a flip. If there are pockets then reflect one pocket across its line of support of the polygon to obtain a new simple polygon. In 1934 Paul Erdős introduced the problem of repeatedly flipping all the pockets of a simple polygon simultaneously and he conjectured that the polygon would become convex after a finite number of flips. In 1939 Béla Nagy proved that if at each step only one pocket is flipped the polygon will become convex after a finite number of flips. The history of this problem is reviewed, and a simple elementary proof is given of a stronger version of the theorem. Variants, generalizations, and applications of the theorem of interest in computational knot theory, polymer physics and molecular biology are discussed. Several results in the literature are improved with the application of the theorem. For example, Grünbaum and Zaks recently showed that even non-simple (self-crossing) polygons may be convexified in a finite number of suitable flips. Their flips each take  $\Theta(n^2)$  time to determine. A simpler proof of this result is given that yields an algorithm that takes  $O(n)$  time to determine each flip. In the context of knot theory Millet proposed an algorithm for convexifying equilateral polygons in 3-dimensions with a generalization of a flip called a pivot. Here Millet's algorithm is generalized so that it works also in dimensions higher than three and for polygons containing edges with arbitrary lengths. A list of open problems is included.

© 2004 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Polygons; Flips; Polygonal linkages; Convexification; Pivots; Curve inflation; Flipturns; Self-avoiding walks; Knot theory; Computational geometry; Robotics; Polymer physics; Molecular reconfiguration

---

---

*E-mail address:* [godfried@cs.mcgill.ca](mailto:godfried@cs.mcgill.ca) (G. Toussaint).

<sup>1</sup> This research was supported by NSERC and FCAR.




Fig. 1. Rotating a reflex vertex using the third dimension.

## 1. Introduction

Let  $A = A_1A_2A_3A_4$  be a nonconvex quadrilateral in the two-dimensional  $xy$ -plane with  $A_3$  as its reflex vertex (refer to Fig. 1). Furthermore, assume that the quadrilateral (although planar) is embedded in the 3D space with axes  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$ , that the vertices are *ball-joints* which allow rotations in all directions in 3D. Finally, assume the links (edges) are rigid line segments with  $A_1A_2 = A_1A_4$  and  $A_2A_3 = A_3A_4$ . If we lift vertex  $A_3$  off the  $xy$ -plane into the third dimension  $z$  (leaving the other three vertices fixed) by rotating it about the line through  $A_2$  and  $A_4$  until it returns to the  $xy$ -plane at position  $B_3$ , then the quadrilateral has been convexified with one simple motion. This rotation motion in 3D is equivalent to a reflection transformation in the  $xy$ -plane:  $B_3$  is the reflection of  $A_3$  across the line through  $A_2$  and  $A_4$ .

A generalization of this quadrilateral convexification problem has been discovered and re-discovered independently by several mathematicians, biologists, chemists, physicists and computer scientists dating back to 1935. Computer scientists are motivated by practical robotics problems with linkages. Chemists are interested in the conformation space of carbon rings and other molecules modeled as polygons in space [35,36]. Molecular biologists and polymer physicists are interested in unravelling large molecules (modeled as polygons) such as circular DNA [17]. Mathematicians are curious about the geometric properties of polygons and simple closed curves.

The first person to propose this polygon reconfiguration problem appears to have been Paul Erdős in 1935 [14] in the context of planar polygons. Consider the simple polygon  $P$  in Fig. 2(a). If we subtract this polygon from its convex hull we obtain the convex deficiency: a collection of open connected regions. Each such region together with its boundary is itself a polygon, often called a *pocket* of  $P$ . The polygon  $P$  in Fig. 2(a) has two pockets  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Each pocket has an edge which coincides with a convex hull edge of  $P$  (shown in the figure by dotted lines). Such an edge is called the *pocket lid*.

Erdős defined a reflection operation on  $P$  as a simultaneous reflection of all the pockets of  $P$  about their corresponding pocket lids. Applying a reflection operation to polygon  $P$  in Fig. 2(a) yields the new polygon  $P'$  in Fig. 2(b). In 1935 Erdős conjectured that given any simple polygon, a *finite* number of such reflection steps will convexify it. The first proof of Erdős' conjecture was provided in 1939 by Béla de Sz.-Nagy [12]. First Nagy observed that reflecting *all* the pockets in one step can lead from a simple polygon to a non-simple one. One such example due to Nagy is shown in Fig. 3. Therefore he modified Erdős' problem slightly by defining one step to be the reflection of only *one* pocket. Since a pocket is




Fig. 2. Flipping the pockets of a polygon.




Fig. 3. Flipping two pockets simultaneously may lead to a crossing polygon.




Fig. 4. The polygon on the left is convexified after four flips.

reflected into a previously empty half-plane, no collisions can occur with such a motion. Let us call such an operation a *flip*.

Fig. 4 shows a polygon being convexified after four flips. The pockets at each flip are shown in white before flipping and shaded after the flip is completed. Nagy then proceeded to prove that any simple polygon can be convexified by a *finite* number of flips.

## 2. Rediscoveries of the Erdős–Nagy theorem

Branko Grünbaum [19] described some of the strange history of this problem and uncovered several rediscoveries of the theorem. He also provided his own version of a proof which is similar to Nagy's proof with one of the main differences being that at each step he flips the pocket that has maximum area (if more than one pocket exists). Here we first briefly outline Grünbaum's findings and then add some more rediscoveries and variants to the history of this problem.

As mentioned previously, in 1939 Béla Nagy changed Erdős' problem slightly by reflecting only one pocket of the polygon at each step so that simplicity is maintained during the convexification process. As we shall see later, maintaining simplicity during the process is not necessary if the definition of a flip is suitably modified.

In 1957 there appeared two Russian papers by Reshetnyak [37] and Yusupov [53] proving the theorem with variants of basically the same proof.

In 1959 Kazarinoff and Bing [24] announced the problem with a solution. Two years later a proof appeared in a paper by Bing and Kazarinoff [8] and also in Kazarinoff's book [23]. They also conjectured that every simple polygon will be convex after at most  $2n$  flips.

In 1973 two students of Grünbaum at the University of Washington, R.R. Joss and R.W. Shannon worked on this problem but did not publish their results. An account of the unfortunate circumstances surrounding this event is given by Grünbaum [19]. They found a counter-example to the conjecture of Bing and Kazarinoff (unaware of the conjecture of course). They showed that given any positive integer  $k$ , there exist simple polygons (indeed quadrilaterals suffice) that cannot be convexified with fewer than  $k$  flips.

In 1981 Kaluza [21] posed the problem again and asked if the number of flips could be bounded as a function of the number of vertices of the polygon.

In 1993 Bernd Wegner [50] took up Kaluza's challenge and solved both problems again. His proof of convexification in a finite number of flips is quite different from the others but his example for unboundedness is the same as that of Joss and Shannon.

In 1999 Biedl et al. [6] rediscovered the problem again and obtained the same results as Wegner. Their proofs of convexification are remarkably similar and their unboundedness example is the same quadrilateral.

## 3. A proof of the Erdős–Nagy theorem

Some of the published proofs of the Erdős–Nagy theorem are long and technical, others make references to higher mathematics, and some have gaps. Therefore, for both completeness and pedagogical reasons, it is appropriate to borrow the best features of the existing proofs, fill in the gaps, and present a simple, clear, elementary and short proof of the theorem. We will also prove several theorems that make use of the Erdős–Nagy theorem as a lemma. In this section we present such a proof along the lines of Nagy's reasoning, but first we consider a simple lemma for convex polygons that will be used in the proof. We assume that the convex polygon has no vertices with angle equal to  $\pi$ . If this is not the case it is a simple matter to scan the polygon in  $O(n)$  time and delete vertices with angle equal to  $\pi$  by substituting longer edges where appropriate.




Fig. 5. The convexity tolerance disk of a vertex.

**Lemma 1.** *Given a convex polygon, there exists a positive real number  $\varepsilon$  such that if some or all of the vertices are each moved by a distance less than  $\varepsilon$ , then the polygon remains convex.*

**Proof.** Consider vertex  $A_i$  and its two adjacent vertices  $A_{i-1}$  and  $A_{i+1}$  (refer to Fig. 5). Let  $L_i$  be the line passing through the midpoints of the two edges  $A_i A_{i-1}$  and  $A_i A_{i+1}$ , and let  $r_i$  denote the minimum distance between  $A_i$  and  $L_i$ . Note that  $r_i$  is also the minimum distance between  $A_{i-1}$  and  $L_i$  as well as between  $A_{i+1}$  and  $L_i$ . Now construct disks  $D_i$ ,  $D_{i-1}$  and  $D_{i+1}$ , all of the same radius  $r_i$ , centered at  $A_i$ ,  $A_{i-1}$  and  $A_{i+1}$ , respectively. No matter where the vertices move, as long as each remains in the interior of its corresponding disk, their final positions  $B_i$ ,  $B_{i-1}$  and  $B_{i+1}$  will have the property that  $B_i$  is separated by the line  $L_i$  from  $B_{i-1}$  and  $B_{i+1}$ . Therefore vertex  $B_i$  is convex. If we choose for the radius of our disk for every vertex the value  $\varepsilon = \min\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$  then all vertices will remain convex and since the polygon is simple it follows from Proposition 5 in [18] that it is convex.  $\square$

This number  $\varepsilon$  is sometimes called the *convexity-tolerance* of the polygon [1]. It is a measure of how much the vertices of a convex polygon may be perturbed while guaranteeing that the polygon remains convex.

**Theorem 1.** *Every simple polygon can be convexified with a finite number of flips.*

**Proof.** Let  $A^0 = A_1^0 A_2^0 \dots A_n^0$  denote the given polygon before any flips have taken place. After performing  $k$  flips we obtain the polygon  $A^k = A_1^k A_2^k \dots A_n^k$  where vertex  $A_i^0$  is taken to  $A_i^k$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . We will call polygon  $A^m$  a *descendant* of  $A^k$  if  $m > k$ . Consider any point  $x$  in  $A^0$ . Since for all  $k$ , polygon  $A^{k+1}$  contains  $A^k$ , point  $x$  remains in all the descendants of  $A^0$ . We are interested in the distance between point  $x$  and a vertex of the  $k$ th descendant of  $A^0$ ,  $d(x, A_i^k)$ . After the next flip  $A_i^k$  either remains fixed or is reflected across a line of support  $L$  (refer to Fig. 6). In the latter case this line is the perpendicular bisector of the segment  $A_i^k A_i^{k+1}$ . Let  $x'$  denote the intersection of line  $L$  with segment  $x A_i^{k+1}$ . Then we have

$$d(x, A_i^{k+1}) = d(x, x') + d(x', A_i^{k+1}).$$

Since  $x'$  is equidistant from  $A_i^k$  and  $A_i^{k+1}$  we obtain

$$d(x, A_i^{k+1}) = d(x, x') + d(x', A_i^k).$$

It follows from the triangle inequality that

$$d(x, A_i^{k+1}) \geq d(x, A_i^k).$$




Fig. 6. A flip increases the distance from a fixed point to a vertex.

Therefore the distance function  $d(x, A_i^k)$  is a monotonically non-decreasing function of  $k$ . Furthermore, since the edges are rigid, the perimeter of every descendant of  $A^0$  remains constant after every flip. Therefore the distance  $d(x, A_i^k)$  is bounded from above by half the perimeter of  $A^0$ . From these two observations and the least-upper-bound theorem for real numbers it follows that the sequence  $\{d(x, A_i^k)\}$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  has a limit. Let us denote the limit of  $A_i^k$  (if it exists), as  $k$  goes to infinity, by  $A_i^*$ . Thus, in the limit,  $A_i^*$  would lie on a circle with center  $x$ . However, observe that this holds true for any  $x$  in the interior of the convex hull of  $A^0$ . Therefore if we take  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  to be three noncollinear points in the interior of the convex hull of  $A^0$ , then  $A_i^*$  must lie on all three circles determined by  $x_1, x_2, x_3$ . Since three circles whose centers are noncollinear intersect in at most one point, it follows that  $A_i^*$  exists as a limit point. Therefore there exists a limit polygon  $A^* = A_1^* A_2^* \dots A_n^*$ .

It remains to show that the limit polygon  $A^*$  is convex and reached after a finite number of flips.

Firstly we remark that the limit polygon  $A^*$  must be a simple polygon. In other words, different vertices cannot converge to one and the same limit vertex. This follows from the observation above that  $d(x, A_i^k)$  is a monotonically non-decreasing function of  $k$ , where the role of  $x$  is now played by another vertex  $A_j^k$  where  $j \neq i$ . If both  $A_j^k$  and  $A_i^k$  move with the next flip, then

$$d(A_j^{k+1}, A_i^{k+1}) = d(A_j^k, A_i^k).$$

If only  $A_i^k$  moves, then

$$d(A_j^{k+1}, A_i^{k+1}) \geq d(A_j^k, A_i^k).$$

Therefore two vertices of  $A^k$  cannot move closer together when we flip  $A^k$ .

Secondly we note that the limit polygon  $A^*$  must be convex, for otherwise, being a simple polygon, another flip would alter its shape contradicting that it is the limit polygon.

Thirdly, some vertices of  $A^*$  will have interior angles equal to  $\pi$  and others less than  $\pi$ . Note also that whenever a vertex  $A_i^k$  becomes straight it remains straight for all descendants of  $A^k$ . Therefore we may ignore straight vertices in the analysis.

Finally, it remains to show that the sequence  $\{A^0, A^1, \dots, A^k\}$  where  $A^k = A^*$  is finite. To this end let us now construct around each vertex  $A_i^*$  whose interior angle is less than  $\pi$  a disk  $D_i$  of radius  $\varepsilon$ , the convexity tolerance of  $A^*$ . Consider the sequence of positions of the  $i$ th vertex  $\{A_i^0, A_i^1, A_i^2, \dots\}$ . Since  $A_i^m$  converges to  $A_i^*$  as  $m$  approaches infinity, there must exist a finite number  $c_i$  of flips after which  $A_i^{c_i}$  enters disk  $D_i$ . If we let  $c^* = \max\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$ , then after  $c^*$  flips every vertex has entered its corresponding limit disk and it follows from Lemma 1 that  $A^{c^*}$  must be convex. Hence  $A^k$  is convex for  $k = c^*$  flips.  $\square$

To conclude this section we mention that since the convex hull of a simple polygon may be computed in  $O(n)$  time [29,31] it follows that each flip may be done in  $O(n)$  time.

#### 4. Stronger versions of the Erdős–Nagy theorem

Even in a non-simple (self-crossing) polygon a line of support of the polygon may contain two vertices, say  $A$  and  $B$ , which divide the polygon into two chains connecting  $A$  and  $B$ . One may wonder if repeatedly flipping one of these chains across the line of support will also convexify a non-simple polygon in a finite number of flips. This is indeed the case as was recently proved by Grünbaum and Zaks [20] for planar polygons and extended to more general curves by Wegner [51].

All the published proofs of the Erdős–Nagy theorem (for simple polygons) are based on increasing area in that they depend on the fact that after every flip the new polygon contains the previous one in its interior. For crossing polygons, on the other hand, the notions of increasing area and interior lose their meaning. Therefore Grünbaum and Zaks [20] use a different approach in their proof for crossing polygons. At each step they select, from all the possible candidate flips determined by lines of support, the flip that maximizes the sum of the distances between all pairs of vertices of the polygon. This function has the desired property that it strictly increases after each flip. Unfortunately it requires  $\Theta(n^2)$  time to compute each flip. We will show that there is a simple proof of a stronger version of this theorem that follows directly from the Erdős–Nagy theorem and that leads to a simpler algorithm in which each flip may be computed in  $O(n)$  time. First we show for the case of simple polygons that the Erdős–Nagy theorem can be strengthened by requiring that during the entire convexification procedure a specified edge of the polygon remain fixed. This result will then be used to prove the more general theorem for crossing polygons.

##### 4.1. Mirror-flips

The Erdős–Nagy theorem for simple polygons in the plane may be strengthened somewhat by introducing a reflection operation we call a *mirror-flip*. Consider the polygon  $P$  in Fig. 7(a) and let  $L$  be a line of support of  $P$  that contains the non-adjacent vertices  $A$  and  $B$ . These vertices divide the polygon into two chains: the *inner* and the *outer* chains. Each of these two chains together with segment  $AB$  define a new polygon. The inner chain is the chain that defines the polygon contained in the polygon determined by the other (outer) chain. The standard flip employed in the Erdős–Nagy theorem flips the inner chain about  $L$  as illustrated in Fig. 7(b) to obtain the shaded polygon  $P'$ . On the other hand, the mirror-flip operation reflects the outer chain as illustrated in Fig. 7(c) to obtain the shaded polygon  $P''$ .

First observe that if instead of performing a flip we do a corresponding mirror-flip the two resulting polygons are mirror images of each other. It follows from the Erdős–Nagy theorem that if at each step a flip is to be performed we choose at random to either perform a flip or its corresponding mirror-flip (say by the flip of a coin), then such a procedure must result in a convex polygon after a finite number of flips and mirror-flips. Secondly, instead of using a coin to decide whether to flip or mirror-flip, we could just as well decide by requiring a specified edge of the polygon to remain fixed in the plane during the entire process. If at any step the specified edge is part of the flipping (inner) chain we perform the mirror-flip (outer chain) instead and vice-versa. Thus this procedure will convexify the polygon with the additional constraint that a preselected edge remain fixed in the plane at all times. Finally, note that this procedure




Fig. 7. A simple polygon (left), a flip (center) and its corresponding mirror-flip on the right.

may yield a convex polygon with the opposite orientation to that of the initially given polygon. If this is the case it suffices to flip the convex polygon once more about the line containing the fixed edge. We have therefore proved the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** *Every simple polygon can be convexified with a finite number of flips or mirror-flips while keeping a specified edge fixed.*

#### 4.2. Crossing polygons

We will now use Theorem 2 to prove that a self-crossing polygon  $P_n$  with vertices  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  may be convexified with a finite number of flips and mirror-flips while maintaining a specified edge of  $P$  fixed in the plane. For simplicity of exposition we assume the polygon is in general position in the sense that its vertices are distinct and no three of them lie on a line.

**Theorem 3.** *Every crossing polygon can be convexified with a finite number of flips and mirror-flips, while keeping a specified edge fixed, in  $O(n)$  time per flip and mirror-flip.*

**Proof.** (By induction on  $n$ .) We begin by observing that the result is trivial if  $n = 3$ . For  $n > 3$  assume that the assertion is already known for polygons with  $n - 1$  vertices. We want to prove the result for polygons of  $n$  vertices. Let  $P_n$  denote the given polygon. Let us assume that edge  $A_i A_{i+1}$  has been chosen to remain fixed during convexification. Replace vertex  $A_i$  and its incident edges in  $P_n$  with an edge joining  $A_{i-1}$  and  $A_{i+1}$ , resulting in a polygon  $P'_{n-1}$  of  $n - 1$  edges. By the induction hypothesis  $P'_{n-1}$  may be convexified leaving any edge fixed. Therefore let us choose edge  $A_{i-1} A_{i+1}$  as the fixed edge and let  $P^*_{n-1}$  denote the convexified version of  $P'_{n-1}$  (refer to Fig. 8). Now delete edge  $A_{i-1} A_{i+1}$  from  $P^*_{n-1}$  and replace it with  $A_i$  and its incident edges in  $P_n$  to obtain polygon  $P_n^*$ .

It remains to show that  $P_n^*$  can be convexified with a finite number of flips and mirror-flips leaving  $A_i A_{i+1}$  fixed. Consider where  $A_i$  may lie with respect to line  $L$ , the line that contains  $A_{i-1}$  and  $A_{i+1}$ . Note that  $A_i$  cannot lie on line  $L$  for it would mean  $A_i, A_{i-1}$  and  $A_{i+1}$  are collinear contradicting the assumption that no three vertices lie on a line. Without loss of generality let the line  $L$  be directed from  $A_{i+1}$  to  $A_{i-1}$  and assume  $P^*_{n-1}$  lies to the right of  $L$ . We have two cases.






Fig. 8. Illustrating the induction proof for flipping a crossing polygon.

*Case 1:* If  $A_i$  lies to the left of  $L$  then  $P_n^*$  is a simple polygon and the result follows from Theorem 2.

*Case 2:* If  $A_i$  lies to the right of  $L$  then we can reflect the chain connecting  $A_{i+1}$  to  $A_{i-1}$ , namely  $A_{i+1}, A_{i+2}, \dots, A_{i-2}, A_{i-1}$ , across line  $L$  to reduce it to case 1. This completes the correctness part of the proof.

Let us turn to the complexity. The induction proof suggests the following algorithm. Let  $P_n = A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  denote the given polygon and without loss of generality assume that edge  $A_1A_2$  is selected to remain fixed. Initially select the first three vertices  $A_1A_2A_3$  as the convex polygon with edge  $A_1A_2$  fixed. Advance one vertex on  $P_n$  to  $A_4$  and consider the quadrilateral determined by these four vertices and the “phantom” edge (diagonal)  $A_1A_4$ . Next convexify this quadrilateral using the rules specified above to ensure edge  $A_1A_2$  remains fixed. If triangle  $A_3A_4A_1$  is to be flipped about the line containing  $A_1$  and  $A_3$  then flip the *entire* chain  $A_3A_4, \dots, A_1$ . Proceed in this fashion until  $A_n$  is reached.

Note that this convexification procedure may yield a convex polygon with orientation opposite to that of the original given polygon  $P_n$ . If a convexification with the same orientation is desired simply flip the chain connecting the fixed edge  $A_1A_2$  about the line containing this edge. Each flip or mirror flip only requires precomputing the convex hull of a simple polygon (for flips only) and recomputing the coordinates of the polygon’s vertices. Therefore  $O(n)$  time suffices per flip or mirror-flip.  $\square$

Note that the proof of Theorem 3 carries through even if  $A_i$  lies on  $L$ . If it lies on the segment  $A_{i+1}A_{i-1}$  the resulting polygon is convex and there is nothing to do. If it lies on  $L$  and, say, above  $A_{i-1}$  then the line of support  $L'$  of  $A_i$  and some other vertex  $A_k$  determine a subchain that can be reflected across  $L'$  to yield the desired simple polygon. Therefore, this approach may be applied to more general polygons where collinearities of vertices are allowed. Indeed, Grünbaum and Zaks [20] prove convexification for a very general class of non-simple polygons called *exposed* polygons.

To close this section note that our proof has two features not present in [20]. The first is that we can “freeze” a given edge of the polygon during convexification thus preventing the unfolding from “running away”. The second is the reduced computational complexity involved, in the determination of each flip, in the extended Real RAM model of computation [34]. The algorithm in [20] computes the sum of the distances between all the pairs of vertices of the polygon to decide which flip to perform. This test requires  $\Theta(n^2)$  time. Furthermore, before this distance computation is performed the convex hull of the

crossing polygon is needed, adding another  $O(n \log n)$  time per flip [33]. For the algorithm given here  $O(1)$  time suffices to decide which flip is to be performed after the convex hull is computed. A mirror flip only involves recomputation of the coordinates of the vertices and takes  $O(n)$  time. Furthermore, a convexification flip involves the computation of the convex hull of a *simple* polygon and is therefore only  $O(n)$  time per flip [29,31].

## 5. Variants and generalizations

### 5.1. Mouth flips

Knot theorists are interested in polygons in 3D (knots). In particular, for the computer analysis of knot spaces (or exploring the respective variety) they are interested in “walk” algorithms that will take one knot into another. Millett [32] rediscovered a special case of the Erdős–Nagy theorem when the polygons satisfy all of the following properties: (1) they are star-shaped, (2) they are equilateral (all edges have equal length) and (3) a flip is made not on a complete pocket of the polygon but only on a reflex vertex reflected across the line joining its adjacent vertices. We will call such a flip a *mouth-flip*. Millett proves that ultimately enough mouth-flips convexify the polygon. However, it follows from an argument similar to that in [19] that not only will the polygon be convexified after a finite number of mouth-flips but this number can be bounded as a function of  $n$  because the polygon is equilateral. To see this note that the *before-after* positions of a mouth form a parallelogram. Therefore no new slopes (aside from the slopes of the edges of the original polygon) are ever introduced by mouth-flipping. But the area strictly increases after each mouth-flip. Therefore each new polygon generated on the path towards convexity is composed of a new permutation of the edges (no permutation is revisited during this walk). Therefore the number of mouth-flips is bounded by the number of permutations. We can therefore strengthen the result of Millett as follows.

**Theorem 4.** *A star-shaped equilateral polygon with  $n$  vertices can be convexified with at most  $(n - 1)!$  mouth-flips.*

### 5.2. Pivots and hyperplane flips

One way to generalize the original Erdős–Nagy flip in the plane is to consider any two vertices of the polygon and to reflect one of the polygonal chains they determine across the line they define. An additional generalization is obtained if the selected chain is not reflected but rotated (about the line as axis) by some angle (assuming the polygon is embedded in 3D). Finally, a third further generalization is to polygons in  $d$  dimensions. Combining all three ideas leads to a motion which in knot theory and physics is called a *pivot* [27,28,32,49]. Erdős–Nagy flips may be considered as special cases of pivots with planar polygons in 3D where the pairs of vertices that define the pivots are determined by the lines of support of the polygon that determine pockets and each rotation has an angle of  $\pi$ . For the results obtained in this paper that refer to pivots, a pivot will mean a *rotation* pivot. Two vertices of the polygon partition the polygon into two chains. A rotation pivot rotates one of these two chains about the line containing the two vertices as the axis of rotation.

Another special type of pivot which is a natural generalization of Erdős–Nagy flips is as follows. Let  $P$  be a polygon in  $R^d$  and let  $H$  be a hyperplane supporting the convex hull of  $P$  and containing at least two vertices of  $P$ . Reflect one of the resulting polygonal chains across  $H$ . Let us call such motions *hyperplane-flips*. The first person to propose these hyperplane-flips appears to be Gustave Choquet [10] in 1945 for applications to curve stretching, a topic to be discussed in the following. Choquet claimed in [10] (but published no proof) that after a suitable choice of a *countable* number of hyperplane-flips the polygons generated converge to planar convex polygons. These results were rediscovered in 1973 by Sallee [40].

In 1994 Millett [32], in connection with exploring varieties, proposed a “walk” algorithm (consisting mainly of a sequence of pivots) to take any equilateral polygon (knot) in 3D into any other. The interest in equilateral polygons (those with equal length edges) comes from biology where homogeneous macromolecules or polymers such as DNA are modelled by polygons with equal length edges. Here the vertices correspond to the mers and the edges to the bonding force between them. To establish the walk Millett proposed taking an arbitrary polygon  $P$  in 3D to a planar regular polygon. His algorithm consists of three parts: (1) convert  $P$  to a *planar* star-shaped polygon  $P'$ , (2) convert  $P'$  to a convex polygon  $P''$  and (3) convert  $P''$  to a regular polygon. The results of Part (3) have been recently generalized to reconfigure between two arbitrary convex polygons [4]. Part (2) is done using the mouth-flips discussed above on the reflex vertices of  $P'$ . However, his algorithm for part (1) does not always work correctly. His procedure may yield non-simple planar polygons in which all turns are right turns and the winding number is high thus invalidating step (2) of the algorithm (no reflex vertices are found). Independently, and apparently unaware of the earlier work discussed so far, Kapovich and Millson [22] in 1996 proved that any polygon in 3D (even with unequal-length edges) could be convexified in a finite number of pivots. They refer to pivots as *bendings along diagonals*. However, we can obtain a very simple convexification algorithm using pivots by judiciously applying the Erdős–Nagy theorem. Furthermore, the algorithm proposed here generalizes Millett’s theorem and the results of Kapovich and Millson [22] to higher dimensions and allows the inclusion of the constraint that a specified edge of the polygon remain fixed during convexification. In addition, each pivot in the Kapovich–Millson algorithm computes a complicated function maximized over all diagonals of the polygon so as to select the diagonal along which to effect the pivot. It is not clear what the complexity of each of their pivots is, but it is at least  $\Omega(n^2)$ . On the other hand, the algorithm described in the following takes only  $O(n)$  time per pivot.

**Theorem 5.** *In dimensions higher than two any polygon can be convexified with a finite number of pivots, while keeping a specified edge fixed in  $O(n)$  time per pivot.*

**Proof.** Consider the first four vertices of  $P_n$  and refer to Fig. 9. They determine a possibly skew quadrilateral  $Q = (A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)$ . Rotate triangle  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  (if necessary) about an axis of rotation that contains vertices  $A_1$  and  $A_3$  so that the quadrilateral is planar (this is the first pivot). If the resulting planar quadrilateral is not convex apply Erdős flips (which are pivots in dimensions higher than two) to it until it is convex. Note that some of these pivots may carry the remaining polygon with them as in the case of crossing planar polygons. For example, if the quadrilateral  $Q = (A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)$  has a reflex vertex at  $A_4$  then in the flip of  $A_4$  the entire polygonal chain  $A_3, A_4, A_5, \dots, A_1$  is carried along as one rigid body. Now advance to the next vertex  $A_5$  of  $P_n$ . This introduces a new triangle  $A_4, A_5, A_1$  appended to the planar convex quadrilateral obtained thus far. Now pivot this convex quadrilateral about a rotation axis containing  $A_1$  and  $A_4$  until it is coplanar with the new triangle (if necessary). If the resulting pentagon



#### 5.4. Stretching

Let  $A = A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  be a polygon that is reconfigured to another  $B = B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n$ . In other words the corresponding line segments have the same length and to each point on  $A$  there corresponds a point on  $B$  in the obvious way. If for every two points on  $A$  their corresponding points on  $B$  are further (or the same distance) apart then we say that  $B$  is a *chord-stretched* version of  $A$ . In 1973 Sallee [40] proved that for every polygon in  $d$  dimensions there exists a planar convex stretched version. Furthermore he gives an algorithm for carrying out the reconfiguration. Therefore these are stronger results than the convexification results mentioned earlier. The same results were apparently obtained as early as 1945 by Choquet [10]. Strantzen and Brooks [44] prove a conjecture of Yang Lu that if  $B$  is a chord-stretched version of  $A$  and if  $A$  is convex, then  $A$  and  $B$  are congruent.

#### 5.5. Flipturns

Consider a planar polygon with a pocket determined by vertices  $A_i$  and  $A_j$  and refer to Fig. 10. Another generalization of the Erdős flip was considered in 1973 by Joss and Shannon [19] where instead of flipping the pocket we rotate it by 180 degrees about the center of the convex hull edge that determines the pocket. The effect of this kind of flip which they called a *flipturn* is that no new slopes are introduced after a flipturn. What was automatically obtained in the case of mouthflips for star-shaped equilateral polygons is obtained here for any simple polygon by flipping and “turning” in a vertical plane. Joss and Shannon proved that any simple polygon with  $n$  sides can be convexified by a sequence of at most  $(n-1)!$  flipturns. This bound is very loose and they conjectured that  $(n^2)/4$  flipturns are always sufficient. Grünbaum and Zaks [20] showed that even crossing polygons could be convexified with a finite number of flipturns. In 1999 Therese Biedl discovered a polygon such that a bad sequence of flipturns leads to convexification only after  $(n-2)^2/4$  flipturns [7].

A related “cutting” operation is used in physics for self-avoiding walks where the polygonal chain connecting the two vertices in question is just inverted with respect to these vertices. Such a “pivot” is called a *diagonal reflection* [28]. Even more relevant is the work of Dubins et al. [13] on planar simple polygons in  $Z^2$ , the square lattice. Physicists call the flipturn an *inversion*. In [13] it is shown that any simple lattice polygon of  $n$  vertices may be convexified with at most  $n-4$  flipturns. They are not concerned with computational complexity but clearly each flipturn can be done in  $O(n)$  time with any of several convex hull algorithms [29,31]. Therefore we can state the following theorem.




Fig. 10. The polygon  $P'$  results from performing a flipturn on polygon  $P$ .

**Theorem 6.** Any simple  $n$ -vertex polygon in  $Z^2$  can be convexified in  $O(n^2)$  time with at most  $n - 4$  flips.

Modifying slightly the definition of a flip to take into account degeneracies, Ahn et al. [2] showed that any  $n$ -vertex polygon will be convexified after any sequence of at most  $n(n - 3)/2$  modified flips. More recently, Aichholzer et al. [3] gave bounds for the shortest and longest flip sequences applied to *orthogonal* polygons. They also showed that although flip sequences for the same polygon can have significantly different lengths, the shape and position of the final convex polygon is the same for all sequences, and can be computed in  $O(n \log n)$  time.

### 5.6. Non-crossing linkages

None of the work discussed above, apart from the original Erdős–Nagy theorem, is concerned with whether or not edges of the polygon cross each other during reconfiguration. However, in some applications such as linkage analysis in robotics, exploring varieties in knot theory and molecular biology problems, the edges are to be considered as physical barriers so that no crossings are allowed. Biedl et al. [6] explored the area of convexifying polygons under these constraints. Among other things they showed that a planar simple polygon in 3D may be convexified in  $O(n^2)$  time with  $O(n)$  pivots and  $O(n^2)$  4-joint line-tracking motions. Jeff Erickson pointed out that with a slight modification and an amortized complexity analysis the algorithm in [6] runs in  $O(n)$  time. In two dimensions the famous *carpenter's ruler problem* has been recently solved by Connelly, Demaine and Rote [11] with a further improvement by Streinu [45]. In three dimensions unknotted polygons that cannot be convexified have been discovered independently by Biedl et al. [6] (with ten edges) and Cantarella and Johnston [9] (with six edges). Toussaint [47] discovered an additional class of stuck unknotted hexagons. Together with their mirror images this added up to five different classes of stuck unknotted hexagons. In 2003 Aloupis, Ewald and Toussaint [5] discovered another four classes, bringing the total to nine. Two surveys of this area can be found in [46] and [41].

### 5.7. Self-avoiding walks

A central problem in polymer physics and molecular biology is the reconfiguration of large molecules (modelled as polygons) such as circular DNA [17]. To simplify their Monte-Carlo simulations they are usually restricted to  $Z^2$  and  $Z^3$ , i.e., square and cubic lattices in two and three dimensions, respectively. Almost no results are available for the continuum (also off-lattice) model. One notable exception is the work of Stellman and Gans [43] which concerns open polygonal chains in 3D and considers a motion they call a *dihedral rotation* which selects a random edge of the chain and rotates the smaller of the two chains incident to that edge, about the line through that edge as an axis. Some work has also been done on the FCC lattice [49]. Furthermore, in  $Z^2$  and  $Z^3$  not only must vertices be situated on lattice points but the edges are parallel to the coordinate axes and their lengths are all equal. Like the robotics research on linkages, the problems of interest to physicists involve closed simple polygons [13], open simple polygonal chains [30] and simple polygonal trees [16], i.e., polygons, chains and trees that do not intersect themselves; hence the term *self-avoiding walks* for the case of polygons and chains. Generating a random walk that does not self-intersect, especially if it must return to its starting point as in the case of polygons, is difficult (the waiting time is too long due to attrition, i.e., if a random walk crosses itself

at any point other than its starting point it must be discarded and a new walk started). Therefore an efficient method frequently used to generate the chains or polygons is to modify one such object into another by means of a pivot for various definitions of pivot. Unlike the work in linkages however, here we do not care if intersections happen *during* the pivot as long as when the pivot is complete we end up with a simple polygon or chain. In other words, simplicity is required only at certain “snapshots” during the process. In general the pivots used are selected from a variety of transformations such as reflections and rotations of the sub-chain in question. Such transformations even include “cut-and-paste” operations. The reader is referred to a multitude of such problems and results contained in [27]. For example, Madras and Sokal [28] have shown that in  $Z^d$  for  $d \geq 2$  every simple lattice polygonal chain of  $n$  edges can be straightened by some sequence of at most  $2n - 1$  suitable pivots while maintaining simplicity *after* each pivot. The pivots used here are either reflections through coordinate hyperplanes or rotations by  $\pm\pi/2$ .

In order to prove the ergodicity of self-avoiding walks, polymer physicists are also interested in convexifying (and straightening) open polygonal chains under various geometric constraints [42,52]. Such constraints, which include remaining in between two parallel lines or fixing the two endpoints of the chain, have application to polymer adsorption, steric stabilization of colloids and surface magnetism [52]. Madras, Orlitsky and Shepp [26] showed that any lattice polygon in  $Z^d$ , with endpoints fixed, can be convexified with  $O(n^{6(d-2)})$  *generalized* pivots. As a corollary of Theorem 5 we obtain a continuum version of this fixed endpoint theorem for the lattice. Let  $C_n = A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  be an  $n$ -vertex open polygonal chain in  $R^d$  which we want to convexify while holding  $A_1$  and  $A_n$  fixed. Here convexification of the chain means that inserting edge  $A_1A_n$  makes the chain a convex polygon. The fixed endpoint restriction on an open chain is equivalent to having an edge between the endpoints. Therefore we may consider  $C_n$  to be a closed, possibly self-crossing, polygon  $P_n$  which is to be convexified while keeping edge  $A_1A_n$  fixed. Thus Theorem 5 immediately implies the following result.

**Corollary 1.** *In dimensions higher than two any open polygonal chain can be convexified with a finite number of pivots while holding its endpoints fixed in  $O(n)$  time per pivot.*

## 6. Concluding remarks and open problems

Wegner [50] proposed a very interesting variant of Erdős flips which can be considered the inverse problem which he called *deflation*. Given a simple polygon  $P$  in the plane, if there exists a pair of non-adjacent vertices  $A_i$  and  $A_j$  such that the line through  $A_i$  and  $A_j$  is not a line of support of  $P$ , the line intersects the boundary of the polygon only at  $A_i$  and  $A_j$ , and the polygonal chain  $A_i, A_{i+1}, \dots, A_j$  can be reflected about this line to lie inside the polygon then this reflection operation is called a *deflation*. If this cannot be done the polygon is called *deflated*. Wegner conjectured that every simple polygon can be deflated with a finite number of deflations. However, this conjecture has been disproved for  $n = 4$  by Fevens et al. [15].

We conclude by mentioning several open problems in this area.

1. Wegner also introduced two measures of convexity for simple polygons that are functions of the number of flips that will convexify the polygon. He called these the *maximal* and *minimal* inflation complexities. The former is the maximum number of flips that will convexify a polygon. The latter is

the minimum number of flips. There are polygons (quadrilaterals) for which these two numbers are the same. What is the computational complexity of computing these numbers?

2. The Joss–Shannon conjecture that every simple polygon can be convexified with at most  $(n^2)/4$  flipturns is still open. For the best upper and lower bounds as well as further open problems see [3].
3. A planar lattice simple polygon on the other hand can be convexified in  $O(n^2)$  time with  $n - 4$  flipturns. Can this complexity be reduced?
4. The results concerning stuck unknotted hexagons in Cantarella and Johnston [9], Toussaint [47], and Aloupis, Ewald and Toussaint [5] established that there exists a set of ordered edge lengths for which there are nine classes of polygons. Are there edge lengths that admit more than nine classes of stuck unknotted hexagons?

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Jorge Calvo, Erik Demaine, Joe O’Rourke and Branko Grünbaum for reading the manuscript and providing constructive comments. I also thank Bernd Wegner for providing me with several references.

## References

- [1] M. Abellanas, F. Hurtado, P. Ramos, Tolerance of geometric structures, in: Proc. 6th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, 1994, pp. 250–255.
- [2] H.-K. Ahn, P. Bose, J. Czyzowicz, N. Hanusse, E. Kranakis, P. Morin, Flipping your lid, *Geombinatorics* 10 (2) (2000) 57–63.
- [3] O. Aichholzer, C. Cortés, E.D. Demaine, V. Dujmović, J. Erickson, H. Meijer, M. Overmars, B. Palop, S. Ramaswami, G.T. Toussaint, Flipping polygons, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 28 (2002) 231–253.
- [4] O. Aichholzer, E.D. Demaine, J. Erickson, F. Hurtado, M. Overmars, M. Soss, G.T. Toussaint, Reconfiguring convex polygons, *Computational Geometry* 20 (2001) 85–95.
- [5] G. Aloupis, G. Ewald, G.T. Toussaint, More classes of stuck unknotted hexagons, *Contributions to Algebra and Geometry* 45 (2) (2004) 429–434.
- [6] T. Biedl, E. Demaine, M. Demaine, S. Lazard, A. Lubiw, J. O’Rourke, M. Overmars, S. Robbins, I. Streinu, G.T. Toussaint, S. Whitesides, Locked and unlocked polygonal chains in three dimensions, *Discrete Computat. Geom.* 26 (3) (2001) 269–281.
- [7] T.C. Biedl, Polygons needing many flipturns, Technical Report CS-2000-04, Department of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, 2000.
- [8] R.H. Bing, N.D. Kazarinoff, On the finiteness of the number of reflections that change a nonconvex plane polygon into a convex one, *Matematicheskoe Prosveshchenie* 6 (1961) 205–207. In Russian.
- [9] J. Cantarella, H. Johnston, Nontrivial embeddings of polygonal intervals and unknots in 3-space, *J. Knot Theory Ramifications* 7 (8) (1998) 1027–1039.
- [10] G. Choquet, Variétés et corps convexes, in: Association Française pour l’Avancement des Sciences, Congrès de la Victoire-1945, 1945, pp. 91–93.
- [11] R. Connelly, E.D. Demaine, G. Rote, Every polygon can be untangled, in: Proc. 16th European Workshop on Computational Geometry, Eliat, Israel, 2000.
- [12] B. de Sz.-Nagy, Solution of problem 3763, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 46 (1939) 176–177.
- [13] L.E. Dubins, A. Orlicsky, J.A. Reeds, L.A. Shepp, Self-avoiding random loops, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 34 (1988) 1509–1516.
- [14] P. Erdős, Problem number 3763, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 42 (1935) 627.



- [15] T. Fevens, A. Hernández, A. Mesa, P. Morin, M. Soss, G.T. Toussaint, Simple polygons with an infinite sequence of deflations, *Contributions to Algebra and Geometry* 42 (2) (2001) 307–311.
- [16] P.W. Finn, D. Halperin, L.E. Kavraki, J.-C. Latombe, R. Motwani, C. Shelton, S. Venkatasubramanian, Geometric manipulation of flexible ligands, in: *Applied Computational Geometry*, Springer, Berlin, 1996, pp. 67–78.
- [17] M.D. Frank-Kamenetskii, *Unravelling DNA*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1997.
- [18] B. Grünbaum, Polygons, in: *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer, Berlin, 1975, pp. 147–184.
- [19] B. Grünbaum, How to convexify a polygon, *Geombinatorics* 5 (1995) 24–30.
- [20] B. Grünbaum, J. Zaks, Convexification of polygons by flips and by flipturns, *Discrete Math.* 241 (2001) 333–342.
- [21] T. Kaluza, Problem 2: Konvexieren von Polygonen, *Math. Semesterber.* 28 (1981) 153–154.
- [22] M. Kapovich, J.J. Millson, The symplectic geometry of polygons in euclidean space, *J. Differential Geom.* 44 (1996) 479–513.
- [23] N.D. Kazarinoff, *Analytic Inequalities*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- [24] N.D. Kazarinoff, R.H. Bing, A finite number of reflections render a nonconvex plane polygon convex, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* 6 (1959) 834.
- [25] W.J. Lenhart, S.H. Whitesides, Reconfiguring closed polygonal chains in euclidean  $d$ -space, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 13 (1995) 123–140.
- [26] N. Madras, A. Orlitsky, L.A. Shepp, Monte Carlo generation of self-avoiding walks with fixed endpoints and fixed length, *J. Statist. Phys.* 58 (1990) 159–183.
- [27] N. Madras, G. Slade, *The Self-Avoiding Walk*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993.
- [28] N. Madras, A.D. Sokal, The pivot algorithm: a highly efficient Monte Carlo method for the self-avoiding walk, *J. Statist. Phys.* 50 (1988) 109–186.
- [29] D. McCallum, D. Avis, A linear algorithm for finding the convex hull of a simple polygon, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 9 (1979) 201–206.
- [30] F.M. McMillan, *The Chain Straighteners*, MacMillan Press, 1979.
- [31] A. Melkman, On-line construction of the convex hull of a simple polyline, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 25 (1987) 11–12.
- [32] K. Millett, Knotting of regular polygons in 3-space, *J. Knot Theory Ramifications* 3 (1994) 263–278.
- [33] J. O’Rourke, *Computational Geometry in C*, second ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [34] F.P. Preparata, M.I. Shamos, *Computational Geometry: An Introduction*, Springer, New York, 1985.
- [35] R. Randell, Conformation spaces of molecular rings, in: *Studies in Physical and Theoretical Chemistry*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1988, pp. 141–156.
- [36] R. Randell, A molecular conformation space, in: *Studies in Physical and Theoretical Chemistry*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1988, pp. 125–140.
- [37] Yu.G. Reshetnyak, On a method of transforming a nonconvex polygonal line into a convex one, *Uspehi Mat. Nauk* 12 (3) (1957) 189–191. In Russian.
- [38] S.A. Robertson, Inflation of plane curves, in: *Geometry and Topology of Submanifolds-III*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1991, pp. 264–275.
- [39] S.A. Robertson, B. Wegner, Full and partial inflation of plane curves, in: *Intuitive Geometry*, Colloquia Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1994, pp. 389–401.
- [40] G.T. Sallee, Stretching chords of space curves, *Geom. Dedicata* 2 (1973) 311–315.
- [41] M. Soss, G.T. Toussaint, Convexifying polygons in 3d: a survey, *Contemp. Math.* 304 (2002) 269–285.
- [42] C.E. Soteris, S.G. Whittington, Polygons and stars in a slit geometry, *J. Phys. A* 21 (1988) L857–L861.
- [43] S.D. Stellman, P.J. Gans, Efficient computer simulation of polymer conformation. I. Geometric properties of the hard-sphere model, *Macromolecules* 5 (1972) 516–526.
- [44] J. Strantzen, J. Brooks, A chord stretching map of a convex loop is an isometry, *Geom. Dedicata* 41 (1992) 51–62.
- [45] I. Streinu, A combinatorial approach to planar non-colliding robot arm motion planning, in: *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science*, Redondo Beach, CA, 2000.
- [46] G.T. Toussaint, Computational polygonal entanglement theory, in: *VIII Encuentros de Geometría Computacional*, Castellon, Spain, 1999, pp. 269–278.
- [47] G.T. Toussaint, A new class of stuck unknots in  $Pol_6$ , *Contributions to Algebra and Geometry* 42 (2) (2001) 301–306.
- [48] G.T. Toussaint, Simple proofs of a geometric property of four-bar linkages, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 110 (6) (2003) 482–494.
- [49] E.J. Janse van Rensburg, S.G. Whittington, N. Madras, The pivot algorithm and polygons: results on the FCC lattice, *J. Phys. A* 23 (1990) 1589–1612.

- [50] B. Wegner, Partial inflation of closed polygons in the plane, *Contributions to Algebra and Geometry* 34 (1) (1993) 77–85.
- [51] B. Wegner, Chord-stretched convex versions of planar curves with self-intersections, Technical Report, Department of Mathematics, Technical University of Berlin, 1999.
- [52] S.G. Whittington, Self-avoiding walks with geometrical constraints, *J. Statist. Phys.* 30 (2) (1983) 449–456.
- [53] A.Ya. Yusupov, A property of simply-connected nonconvex polygons, *Uchen. Zapiski Buharsk. Gos. Pedagog.* (1957) 101–103. In Russian.